

REMARKS

Specification

By the Office Action dated December 9, 2008, the Examiner has objected to the Specification. Applicants have amended the Specification accordingly. Applicants
5 respectfully submit that the Specification, as amended, complies with the requirements of the MPEP and 37 CFR.

Cancelled Claims 2-5, 19 and 21

In this Amendment, Applicants have cancelled claims 2-5, 19 and 21 from further consideration in this application. Applicant is not conceding that the subject matter
10 encompassed by claims 2-5, 19 and 21, prior to this Amendment is not patentable over the art cited by the Examiner. Claims 2-5, 19 and 21 were cancelled in this Amendment solely to facilitate expeditious prosecution of the present Application by the Examiner. Applicant respectfully reserves the right to pursue claims, including the subject matter encompassed by claims 2-5, 19 and 21 as presented prior to this Amendment and additional claims in
15 one or more continuing applications.

Abstract

By the Office Action dated December 9, 2008, the Examiner has objected to the Abstract. Applicants have amended the Abstract accordingly. Applicants respectfully
20 submit that the Abstract, as amended, complies with the requirements of the MPEP and 37 CFR.

35 U.S.C. § 101 Claim Rejections

By the Office Action dated December 9, 2008, the Examiner has rejected claims 1 and 6 under 35 U.S.C. § 101. Applicants have amended claims 1 and 6. Applicants
25 respectfully submit that claims 1 and 6, as amended, comply with 35 U.S.C. § 101.

35 U.S.C. § 103 Claim Rejections

By the Office Action dated December 9, 2008, the Examiner has rejected claims 1 and 6 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Blizniak et al. (U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 20030220993 A1) (hereinafter “Blizniak”) in view of
30 Hillerbrand et al. (U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 20040054690 A1) (hereinafter “Hillerbrand”). In order to form a proper obviousness rejection of a claim under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a), a collection of references together must teach or suggest each element of the

claim, including the relationships between the elements. If any element is not fully taught by the combined references, the rejection cannot be sustained.

Evaluating Blizniak in view of Hillerbrand in this light, it is appropriate to examine the portions of Blizniak in view of Hillerbrand that the Examiner has pointed to as teaching the claimed elements of the rejected claims.

Claim 1

The Examiner asserted that “[a]s to Claim 1, Blizniak teaches the invention substantially as claimed”. (See Office Action, page 4, paragraph 1.) The Examiner admitted that “Blizniak does not teach returning a reference from the service registry in response to the searching.” (See Office Action, page 4, paragraph 2.) The Examiner then asserted that “[h]owever, Hillerbrand teaches returning a reference from the service registry in response to the searching (communications with the resource registry 142 to retrieve the identified execution model, which is returned to the public service module 415 para [0310], ln 15-19).” (See Office Action, page 4, paragraph 2.) The Examiner then asserted that

[i]t would have been obvious to one of the ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the teaching of Blizniak with Hillerbrand to incorporate the feature of returning a reference from the service registry in response to the searching because this retrieves any pre-stored business information models that may be relevant for association with the ontological model of the selected web service.

(See Office Action, page 5, paragraph 1.)

To the extent the Examiner's language at pages 4-5 of the Office Action can be understood, it appears that the Examiner has asserted the following correspondence between Blizniak and Hillerbrand and claim 1:

Claim 1	<u>Blizniak</u>	<u>Hillerbrand</u>
1. A method <i>performed on a computer</i>	<u>Blizniak</u> does not teach this claim element.	<u>Hillerbrand</u> does not teach this claim element.

<p>of mapping at least one web service to at least one OSGi service, the method comprising:</p> <p>creating a proxy bundle corresponding to the at least one web service;</p> <p>registering a proxy web service corresponding to the proxy bundle in a service registry;</p> <p>searching for the at least one web service in the service registry;</p> <p>returning a <i>reference to the proxy web service from the service registry</i> in response to the searching; and</p> <p>invoking at least one method on the returned reference, thereby invoking the at least one web service.</p>	<p><u>Blizniak</u> does not teach this claim element.</p> <p><u>Blizniak</u> does not teach this claim element.</p> <p><u>Blizniak</u> does not teach this claim element.</p> <p><u>Blizniak</u> does not teach this claim element.</p> <p><u>Blizniak</u> does not teach this claim element.</p>	<p><u>Hillerbrand</u> does not teach this claim element.</p> <p><u>Hillerbrand</u> does not teach this claim element.</p> <p><u>Hillerbrand</u> does not teach this claim element.</p> <p><u>Hillerbrand</u> does not teach this claim element.</p> <p><u>Hillerbrand</u> does not teach this claim element.</p>
---	---	--

In reviewing the cited portions of Blizniak and Hillerbrand, however, it becomes apparent that Blizniak and Hillerbrand have been generalized, and, in fact, does not support the position asserted by the Examiner.

5 **returning a reference to the proxy web service from the service registry in response to the searching**

In particular, Blizniak and Hillerbrand, alone or in combination, fail to teach or suggest “returning a *reference to the proxy web service* from the service registry in response to the searching”, as required by claim 1. The Examiner admitted that “Blizniak does not teach returning a reference from the service registry in response to the searching.”

5 (See Office Action, page 4, paragraph 2.) Thus, Blizniak cannot teach or suggest “returning a *reference to the proxy web service* from the service registry in response to the searching”. Hillerbrand fails to teach or suggest “returning a *reference to the proxy web service from the service registry* in response to the searching”. Notably, Hillerbrand fails to teach or suggest either a “proxy web service” or a “service registry” at all. Thus,

10 Hillerbrand cannot teach or suggest “returning a *reference to the proxy web service* from the service registry in response to the searching”. Therefore, Blizniak and Hillerbrand, alone or in combination, cannot teach or suggest the claim 1 element of “returning a *reference to the proxy web service* from the service registry in response to the searching”.

It is therefore clear that Blizniak and Hillerbrand, alone or in combination, cannot teach or suggest each element of claim 1 and, therefore, a rejection of claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) would be inappropriate.

Claim 6

Since dependent claim 6 depends on independent claim 1 and since Blizniak and Hillerbrand, alone or in combination, cannot teach or suggest each element of claim 1,

20 Blizniak and Hillerbrand, alone or in combination, cannot teach or suggest each element of claim 6, and, therefore, a rejection of claim 6 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) is inappropriate.

Conclusion

It is therefore clear that claims 1 and 6 comply with the requirements of 35 U.S.C. §§ 101, 102, 103, and 112. The application is therefore in condition for allowance. Early notification to that effect is respectfully solicited.

In the event that any issue remains unresolved, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at 408-927-3377.

Respectfully Submitted,

5

/Leonard T. Guzman/

Date: March 9, 2009

Leonard T. Guzman

Reg. No. 46,308

10

IBM Almaden Research Center

650 Harry Road

C45A/J2B

San Jose, CA 95120

15

Phone Number: 408-927-3377

Facsimile Number: 408-927-3375